REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-39 as anticipated by *Ichikawa* (US Patent No. 6,307,837). However, *Ichikawa* fails to anticipate claim 1 at least because *Ichikawa* fails to describe "excluding the segment of data from transmission *from the host system* based on the comparison between the portion of the segment and the list." The Examiner cites to the following passage, which is directed towards "discard[ing] [a] data packet" *after* transmission from a packet terminal, as teaching this limitation of claim 1:

> *If the destination terminal is connected to the user LAN 1-4, the data packet is transmitted from gateway 1-3 to user LAN 1-4 though gateway 1-1 or gateway 1-2. If the destination terminal is connected to the wireless packet network, the data packet is sent to the destination terminal without going through the gateway. On the other hand, if the VLAN-ID and the source address 4-2 in the received packet do not match the content in the terminal information, filtering section 16 discards the data packet.* (*Ichikawa*, 9:20-29)

Ichikawa describes that a "data packet" is discarded from the filtering section. As illustrated in figure 2 of *Ichikawa*, the "filtering section" receives the data packet *after* the data packet has already been transmitted from the "packet terminal." That is, instead of teaching "excluding the segment of data from transmission from the host system," *Ichikawa* teaches that the segment of data is transmitted from the "packet terminal" and that the "discarding" of the "data packet" occurs *after* transmission. For at least this reason, *Ichikawa* fails to describe or suggest claim 1's limitation of "excluding the segment of data from transmission from the host system based on the comparison between the portion of the segment and the list" and therefore the Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Claims 17, 27 and 38 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons that the claims on which they depend are patentable. Further, the dependent claims add patentability distinct features with respect to their respective independent claims.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner cites to the following passage from *Ichikawa* as allegedly teaching "generating the VLAN ID based on a network address:"

> *FIG. 1 shows a schematic configuration of the packet network according to the present embodiment. In the figure, a plurality of wireless base stations 1-6 and a wireless packet backbone network 1-5 connecting these wireless base stations 1-6 constitute a wireless packet network. Each of the wireless base stations 1-6 accommodates a plurality of wireless packet terminals 1-7. User LANs 1-4 are other packet networks, and the wireless packet backbone network 1-5 is connected to a plurality of user LANs 1-4 through gateways 1-1.about.1-3. Gateway 1-3 selects one LAN from the user LANs 14 according to VLAN-ID (will be explained later), and after deleting VLAN-ID from the packet, transfers the packet to a selected user LAN. (Ichikawa, 7:7-19)*

The above passage fails to provide any indicate of *how Ichikawa*'s VLAN-ID is generated, let alone that the VLAN ID is generated "based on a network address." For this reason, the above passage fails to teach "generating the VLAN ID based on a network address."

The Examiner cites two other passages, col. 9, lines 12-29 and col. 10, lines 42-67, as also allegedly teaching "generating the VLAN ID based on a network address." The second cited passage, col. 9, lines 12-29, similarly fails to teach "generating the VLAN ID based on a network address" and instead simply addresses the "terminal address/VLAN-ID comparison section." However, the performance of a comparison between the "terminal address" and the "VLAN-ID" fails to teach *how* the VLAN-ID is generated, let alone that the VLAN ID is generated "based on a network address." The third cited passage, col. 10, lines 42-67, also fails to teach "generating the VLAN ID based on a network address," because this passage fails to describe *how* the VLAN ID is generated and therefore fails to describe that the VLAN ID is generated based on a network address. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner cites to the following passage as allegedly teaching the limitation that "the segment is excluded from transmission from the host system if the portion corresponds to the identifier:"

> *Specifically, the terminal address/VLAN-ID comparison section 15 searches in the terminal information table shown in Table 1, and if there is a set of a terminal address and a VLAN-ID in the table to match the source address 4-2 and VLAN-*

> *ID 4-3 in the data packet, the identity is considered to match the terminal information. Filtering section 16 examines the comparison result received, and if the identity matches the terminal information, data packet is sent to the destination terminal specified in the destination address 4-1 (5-2). If the destination terminal is connected to the user LAN 1-4, the data packet is transmitted from gateway 1-3 to user LAN 1-4 though gateway 1-1 or gateway 1-2. If the destination terminal is connected to the wireless packet network, the data packet is sent to the destination terminal without going through the gateway. On the other hand, if the VLAN-ID and the source address 4-2 in the received packet do not match the content in the terminal information, filtering section 16 discards the data packet.* (*Ichikawa*, 9:12-29)

The above passage fails to teach that "the segment is excluded from transmission from the host system if the portion corresponds to the identifier" because in *Ichikawa* the "filtering section 16 discards the data packet" if "the VLAN-ID and the source address 4-2 in the received packet *do not match* the content in the terminal information." In contrast, claim 7 is directed towards exclusion of the data segment if a portion of the data segment "*corresponds* to the identifier." For at least this reason, *Ichikawa* fails to teach that the "the segment is excluded from transmission from the host system if the portion corresponds to the identifier" and therefore the Examiner's rejection of claim 7 is improper and clear error. Claims 21 and 32 include limitations similar to those of claim 7 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 7.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner cites to the following passage as allegedly teaching the limitation of "intentionally corrupting the segment so that the segment is discarded from traffic received over a network connection:"

> *If the destination terminal is connected to the user LAN 1-4, the data packet is transmitted from gateway 1-3 to user LAN 1-4 though gateway 1-1 or gateway 1-2. If the destination terminal is connected to the wireless packet network, the data packet is sent to the destination terminal without going through the gateway. On the other hand, if the VLAN-ID and the source address 4-2 in the received packet do not match the content in the terminal information, filtering section 16 discards the data packet.* (*Ichikawa*, 9:20-29)

The above passage fails to teach "intentionally corrupting the segment." Instead, *Ichikawa* only teaches that certain data packets are discarded not "corrupted," let alone "*intentionally* corrupted." For at least this reason, *Ichikawa* fails to teach "intentionally

corrupting the segment so that the segment is discarded from traffic received over a network connection and therefore the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 is improper. Claims 24 and 35 include limitations similar to those of claim 10 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 10.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable. Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket no. 10559-0916001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:____Tune 2, 2009_____   ____Tonya Clake_____
                                        Tonya S. Drake
                                        Reg. No. 57,861

PTO Customer No. 20985
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

22172733 (3).doc